DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 041 857 SP 004 125

AUTHOR	LeBaron, Walt
TITLE	Elementary Teacher Education Models Analyzed in Relation to National Accreditation Standards.
INSTITUTION	American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.
BUREAU NO	BR-6-9006
PUB DATE	Jul 70
CONTRACT	OEC-0-9-569006-3704(010)
NOTE	19p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.05
DESCRIPTORS	*Academic Standards, Accreditation (Institutions), *Elementary School Curriculum, *Program Evaluation, Program Improvement, *Teacher Education, *Teacher Education Curriculum, Teacher Improvement, Teaching Methods, Teaching Models
IDENTIFIERS	*Comprehensive Elementary Teacher Education Models

ABSTRACT

This report is a cross-evaluation of two significant efforts to improve teacher education in the United States. The USOE models project and the NCATE accreditation standards both recognize that teacher education programs can best be examined as a totality, and both relate program and evaluation of graduates to stated goals. (See also ED037422 for analytic summaries of the models' specifications). The models are not yet operational realities and although their practical feasibility has not been tested, it can be predicted with some degree of certainty in terms of the five major categories in the accreditation standards: 1) curricula for basic programs; 2) faculty; 3) students; 4) resources and facilities; and 5) evaluation, program review and planning. Each of these areas is considered in some detail in the report. The conclusion suggests that, in general, the standards provide a useful mechanism for evaluating the models. Although the ten models have been considered as a group, there are wide differences between them, which will become clear through operation, and the directions indicated will become increasingly useful and will demonstrate the necessity for continued upgrading and improving of standards for accreditation. (MBM)

ED041857

ELEMENTARY TEACHER EDUCATION MODELS ANALYZED IN RELATION TO NATIONAL ACCREDITATION STANDARDS

by Walt LeBaron

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

July 1970

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
One Dupont Circle, Washington, D. C. 20036

SP004125

Published by

THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES FOR TEACHER EDUCATION

July 1970

This is the final report of the Education Systems Department, System Development Corporation, February 1970. The SDC title was "NCATE's New Standards and USOE's Teacher Education Models."

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to Contract No. OEC-0-9-569006-3704(010) with the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

PREFACE

This report is a cross-evaluation of two significant efforts to improve teacher education in the United States, both of which have deeply involved the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

One of these is the U.S. Office of Education elementary teacher education models project, the largest planning activity undertaken in the history of teacher education in this country. Under a USOE contract, the AACTE entered the second phase of this multiphase research and development effort, disseminating information about the ten comprehensive undergraduate and in-service teacher education model programs to colleges and universities throughout the country. The Association conducted this dissemination project--one of its many aimed at improving teacher education--during the past year.

Concurrently, the AACTE--with a long history of involvement in accreditation--was concluding an intensive three-year study to develop new standards for the accreditation of teacher education--the other subject of this report. Involving the participation of thousands of persons and numerous agencies, new standards were developed and tested in eight representative colleges and universities in the United States.

After several revisions, the new standards were finally approved by the AACTE Executive Committee, and in January 1970, they were adopted by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education as the official standards for accrediting basic and advanced teacher education programs.

Because the new standards are not viewed as the "final word," both AACTE and NCATE have provided for their continual review, evaluation, and revision. Toward this end, the AACTE established a Committee on Standards in February 1970, replacing the Evaluative Criteria Study Committee which had acted on a mandate from the National Commission on Accrediting to continuously update NCATE standards.

The USOE models project and the new standards have a strong common element--the recognition that teacher education programs can best be examined as a totality and that efforts to examine discrete elements apart from that totality would be unproductive.

For this reason, the models are frequently referred to in terms of their comprehensiveness and their systems approach. The new standards likewise emphasize stated objectives and program design rather than specific course and time requirements. They each relate program and evaluation of graduates to stated goals.

The System Development Corporation was awarded a competitive contract by the U.S. Office of Education to analyze the models in relation to the new accreditation standards. This report is the analysis made by Walt LeBaron, then associated with SDC. The project was carried out under the general supervision of James P. Steffensen of the Office of Education.

Dr. LeBaron has a wide knowledge of the models, having worked closely with the project during the past year. In addition, he was commissioned by AACTE to make an analysis of the proposed new standards during the final revision phase of the study, and he served as a resource person in the dissemination project's workshops. His analysis was an important input to the Evaluative Criteria Study Committee.

Because this paper relates two such important efforts, AACTE is pleased to make "Elementary Teacher Education Models Analyzed in Relation to National Accreditation Standards" available to the teacher education community at large.

Edward C. Pomeroy
Executive Director
American Association of Colleges
for Teacher Education

July 1970

Introduction Ten elementary teacher education models summarized in a companion report* form part of a program being sponsored by the U.S. Office of Education. The ten models, developed separately by ten research teams from educational institutions across the United States, provide total designs for programs to prepare elementary teachers for the schools of the present and the future. The charter from USOE required that the models incorporate the principles of systems analysis, behavioral learning systems, and other advanced planning techniques. Each model, to a greater or lesser degree, complied with the charter, and as a result, education now has the first specifically planned, total programs of teacher education.

This paper reviews the models on the basis of Recommended Standards for Teacher Education, proposed and published by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) in November, 1969. The standards were approved by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) in January, 1970. The present review thus relates the ten models to generally accepted guidelines for teacher education programs. This information should be useful to institutions which are considering the implementation of a model or the parts from several models. Since the models were designed without reference to the standards and since they have not been operated as yet, no direct relationship can be established. The analysis, however, should indicate the degree to which new program conceptualizations are consonant with present standards for teacher education.

The Purpose of Accreditation Standards The new NCATE standards increase the emphasis on planning for the improvement of teacher education. As the introduction states, "national accreditation represents a common floor of acceptability," and it is not the intention of the standards to limit any institution's flexibility in designing and operating unique programs. The introduction continues, "NCATE accreditation validates the quality of preparation programs and signifies that persons recommended by the institution can be expected to perform satisfactorily in typical

---

* Analytic Summaries of Specifications for Model Teacher Education Programs. Falls Church, Virginia: System Development Corporation (TM-WD-(L)-319/000/00), July 1969. The institutions providing leadership in developing the ten models have been Columbia University Teachers College, Florida State University, University of Georgia, University of Massachusetts, Michigan State University, Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, University of Pittsburgh, Syracuse University, University of Toledo, and University of Wisconsin.

teaching and other professional school positions throughout the United States." From this perspective the standards represent a reasonable framework from which to test the effectiveness of the teacher education models as statements of proposed programs.

The new standards carry a further consideration for the development of experimental and innovative programs:

> Colleges and universities are responding to pressing social needs by developing programs to prepare teachers with special competencies or to prepare new types of teachers. These programs are subject to the same scrutiny as are the other teacher education programs offered by the institution. In some instances, the standards as organized may not provide the best vehicle for assessing such programs. In these cases, the institution is invited to present its experimental or special programs separately. Such presentations should include the rationale for the design of the programs, for admitting students who do not meet the usual criteria for admission, for using faculty members who do not meet the usual requirements for appointment to the full-time faculty, and should show the systematic efforts that are being made to evaluate the graduates of these programs.

This statement is important for the present review because the models are not necessarily organized in ways which make them readily amenable to the forms of evidence suggested as indicating compliance with the standards. For this reason, the standards may require some interpretation, but not so as to detract from their intent. One caveat requires note: when an institution undergoes an evaluation review, it presents all basic and advanced programs for consideration. Presumably accreditation is based on the merits of the institution as well as the strength of each program, in which case some overlap among programs may strengthen all of them. For instance, the program in educational foundations may provide a more complete offering of courses and resources than would be apparent from that area's contribution to elementary teacher education programs. This review, therefore, will assume that if the model meets the intent of the standards through statements of purpose or goals, principles for program design, or outlines of program elements, then the institution has the capability of supporting the program, although the evidence may not be provided by the model.

The Elementary Teacher Education Program The ten elementary teacher education models represent the first deliberate efforts at comprehensive program development in this field. Although such innovations as multi-media, simulated observations, improved subject matter preparation, and new courses have been widely implemented, these new techniques and content have been squeezed into the present operational framework or rejected out-of-hand.

Each of the ten models examines present concepts of program design to determine their effectiveness for improving the interaction between a teacher and a child in a school setting. The results have been sets of new principles and methods of organization for the education of elementary school teachers.

The initial statement of purpose for the models' development describes the program's perspective:

> Any proposals developed for the program should include a rationale, a viable theory, specified objectives, and evaluation components. In addition, concern should be directed to individualized instruction, simulation, self-study, the use of multi-sensory media, multiple approaches to the problem of educating elementary teachers, aspects of team teaching, realistic reality-testing laboratory experiences, built-in systems and costs analyses, inservice education for all personnel conducting such programs, and the results should be transportable as models to other elementary teacher producing institutions.

Within this charter the model developers were given carte blanche to develop radical and future-oriented programs. This consideration is exceedingly important for the discussion which follows. The ten elementary teacher education models are not presently operational realities; they are idealistic conceptualizations for program change and improvement. They have presented program designs without regard to institutional, funding, or other constraints. Phase II of the project, reports from which will be available around April of 1970, will indicate the feasibility of mounting a program based on a model or elements from a number of them. A third phase will finance the initial trial of some

models or parts of models. This actual operation will indicate the degree to which these principles can be translated into ongoing programs. Some measure of reasonableness, however, can be suggested by analyzing the Phase I models in terms of the five major categories of the NCATE standards.

The First Area: Curricula for Basic Programs The intent of this section of the standards is to determine if "curricula for teacher education are designed to achieve explicitly stated objectives." The section has been subdivided to deal with various program aspects, including design of curricula, components for general studies, professional studies, teaching specialty content, humanistic and behavioral studies, teaching and learning theory and practicum, the use of guidelines, and program control. The section implies a teacher education program organized according to these major elements, but each component is flexible enough so that no program should be inhibited by either content or presentation restrictions. The section further assures that the program meets the anticipated needs of prospective teachers.

Each of the teacher education models begins by defining the role, or complex of roles, of the teacher working in the schools of 1975 (or thereafter). The ten models also provide a description of the "learning environment" in which that teacher will operate, including the teacher support team (and/or personnel resources outside the teaching environment), the technological resources available to assist learning, and predictions about changing purposes of education. These descriptions vary considerably; for instance, the Northwest Regional Laboratory model states a number of principles which will direct the total reorganization of the learning environment, but some models anticipate very little change in the organization of the school. The models tend to see the teacher as primarily a manager of the learning process, organizing the elements of the environment to achieve the maximum individualization of learning.

From these descriptions of the teacher and the learning environment, each of the ten models has determined the kinds and numbers of "teacher behaviors" for which a program of preparation must be developed. Program goals, in other words, have been based on an analysis of the acts and conditions of teaching, rather than on the presumed values of standard curricular offerings. This planning technique places emphasis on the teacher's behavior and then justifies knowledge in terms of that behavior. Feedback systems

provide for adjustments when the program is failing to achieve its goals. This kind of planning explicates program goals in direct relation to the perceived needs of the future teacher. The process of goal setting used by the models fulfills the intent of the standards and insures close relationships between programs and goals.

Since the ten elementary teacher education models are based on the principles of behaviorism--so as to organize programs using the concepts of the "learning system"--the content and experiences may not be immediately recognizable according to the major components cited in the standards. Beginning with a behavioral objective, each model specifies the knowledge and experiences which the student must acquire in order to perform at a predetermined criterion level. These groups of behaviors, stated in terms of learning goals and more or less specifically defined, govern the organization of learning experiences. In some cases, the statement is rather uncomplicated, for instance, the knowledge and experience necessary to design bulletin boards explaining number theory. As behaviors become increasingly complex, relating the program to the achievement of objectives becomes difficult and sometimes impossible. Indeed, the ten models indicate clearly that insufficient research exists in many areas. For the models, however, program organization is directly related to the statements of behavioral objectives, rather than to customary curricular divisions as used by the first section of the standards. This consideration requires a concentration on evaluation of the goals-structure rather than the content-structure.

An observer, unfamiliar with this behavioristic orientation, might experience difficulty in adjusting to this emphasis. This section of the standards, however, appears flexible enough to encourage this form of evaluation.

Standard 1.4, "Use of Guidelines Developed by Learned Societies and Professional Associations," may be inapplicable for use with the ten teacher education models. The developers may have referred to such guidelines, but since their charter was to relate their programs to the observed behavior of teachers, part of their task was to define this behavior. To assist this aim, many of the models commissioned "position papers" on various aspects of their planning. Other models developed statements

for each curricular area and/or teaching technique. The ten models also adopt a wide variety of curricular modes, such as the encounter group, democratic interaction group, the learning system, individual guidance and counseling, simulations, and direct contact with the elementary classroom. From these kinds of evidences, each of the models developed its own rationale for the design of its program, using a wide range of advisory resources. This process should meet the intent if not the actual wording of the standard.

Each of the ten elementary teacher education models was required to design a total program of teacher preparation, including both preservice and inservice components. A direct relationship and continuity between these segments was preplanned. A person completing the preservice component would enter teaching and advanced study <u>for classroom teaching</u> as a direct outcome of the preservice training. A program of closely supervised teaching would be accompanied by "course work" on the college campus, eventually leading to an advanced degree. In one instance the student teaching "internship" represents the fifth year of the model's program and is supplemented by a program of course work. In another model the graduate teacher enters a three year program of guided teaching, returning each summer to the campus for courses in theory and educational foundations. At the end of the third summer the teacher receives an advanced degree. Since the ten models represent continuous programs of education from the initial entry through full professional qualification, the distinction made by the standards between "basic teacher education programs" and "programs for the advanced preparation of teachers" appears unnecessary when this type of planning is achieved. Indeed, to examine only one aspect of a model--the preservice or inservice--would be an unfortunate segmentation of a total program plan.

The Second Area: Faculty The standards for faculty are concerned with competence and use, preparation, faculty involvement with schools, conditions for faculty service, and part-time appointments. These areas are not fully discussed in the ten elementary teacher education models, except as they may directly concern a program's development. Again, a caution is required: the reader of a program model will find indications that a

strong faculty is required and references to faculty use and up-grading, but until the feasibility studies are completed, specific aspects of faculty qualifications, assignment, and control must be assumed from the nature of the model. The ten models make clear, however, that only a superior faculty can achieve the objectives envisioned by the models. From this guideline, it must be assumed that the institution considering the adaptation or adoption of a model will provide strong staff and faculty support.

Standard 2.2 requires that faculty be involved with elementary and secondary schools. The ten teacher education models provide strong examples of direct linkages between the college of education and the local schools. In some of the models, notably Georgia, Florida, Michigan, Toledo, and Syracuse, the direct involvement of the local schools has been an integral part of the planning process. Representatives of school districts have met with faculty members to discuss methods for joint planning. Michigan has formed a corporation of local school districts who will function as direct participants in the teacher training activity. Florida developed the concept of the "portal school," a unit within a local district which will be used for student teaching and other student training activities. The faculty of this portal school, selected for their interest in change and innovation, will receive special inservice training to prepare them for effective interaction with the college of education. Syracuse has developed the concept of the "clinical professor." This person will be a member of the staff of the school of education but will work in a school selected for the placement of teacher trainees. The clinical professor will perform in-service training, teacher counseling, and research functions and will facilitate communications between the university and the local school district. The intent of the models is not simply to develop operational linkages but to view school operation and teacher preparation as integral parts of the same system. This concept requires carefully explicated and direct interaction between the institutions at a number of levels and for a variety of purposes related to the goals of both.

Each model expresses a concern that faculty receive special training in the new techniques and technologies required by the model. This may mean learning how to work with a team, how to use various technologies, how to cope with the close student-professor contact envisioned by the model, and how to make decisions based on information. The most specific statement of training needs appears in the Pittsburgh model. Retraining required by the program of individualized instruction is estimated to cost $1,000 per faculty member. The details of retraining programs, however, will be developed as part of the feasibility studies.

Standard 2.3 requires supporting services "that permit faculty members to fulfill their instructional and other professional responsibilities at a high level of performance," so that faculty do not waste time on routine or clerical activities. This part of the standards requires expansion to express the intent of the teacher education models. Their implementations of new technologies, computer-based student management systems, and sophisticated planning techniques mean that a faculty member will work directly with a number of non-teaching specialists and will require their support for the performance of the teaching function. The implication is not one only of assuring the appropriate use of faculty time; it is a requirement of carefully planned, broad-based, interdependent technological applications to education. Very likely, a faculty member could not teach within the sophisticated system unless adequate support personnel were available. Since many of these specialists will be familiar with, but remain outside of, the field of teacher education, new concepts of staff utilization and interaction are required.

The standards are silent on one major change incorporated in planning the ten elementary teacher education models. As a result of the original charter, and because of emerging roles for new institutions, each model worked directly with industry and with research and development groups. Syracuse labeled this interaction "protocooperative" to emphasize the integral and dependent relationships among the school of education, local school districts, education industries, and other organizations. This acknowledgment that forces outside the college of education are required to mount technology-based programs (the word here implies process, not gadgets) emphasizes the new forms of interaction developing within the field of teacher education. As broad-scale, long-range planning receives increasing emphasis, the teacher

education faculty will find itself directly involved with other institutions for the design and operation of programs. The teacher education models have contributed significantly to exploring effective means for developing relationships of this nature.

The Third Area: Students The standards cover three areas of student involvement: admissions and retention, counseling and advising, and participation in program evaluation and development. These areas have been included in the design of each elementary teacher education model. A model specifies the qualifications for entrants and the standards for retention. In some models students with varying profiles may enter, but through individualized program planning each student will achieve the basic competencies before completing the program. The planning of student requirements and counseling are consistent with the principles of behaviorism and systems analysis.

In the models the student represents the input whose behavior must be modified to achieve the desired output. A careful analysis of the input is required so that resources can be used effectively to achieve the output. A constant pattern of pre-test, post-test, and adjustment is necessary if the program is to effectively and efficiently meet its goals. For these purposes, carefully designed testing programs have been developed. Student and group profiles are usually computer stored so that this feedback forms the basis for program changes. Students are regularly counseled, sometimes through assignment to an individual professor, in other instances through membership in an encounter group where students share with each other their experiences and needs. Some models include alternative modes for remediation and for repeating segments which were originally failed. In keeping with the behavioristic orientation, tests of competencies are based on performance, not on the passive acquisition of knowledge. Through this methodology a close relationship is maintained between the student counseling program and the goals of educating a strong teacher candidate.

Student involvement in program design occurs directly and at many levels. From the concept of the learning system, if the student fails, the system has been poorly designed (either through statement of prerequisites or through presentation modes). If a number of students evidence difficulty with a program segment, the need for redesign is indicated. Thus, students are involved

in program design through the feedback process. Direct participation may occur by membership on planning committees, through the student's selection of learning experiences (both the types and the order of experiences), and through relating learning experiences to effective classroom performance.

The Fourth Area: Resources and Facilities This area requires considerable interpretation in determining the relationship of the standards to the teacher education models. The standards are concerned with the adequacy of a library, a materials and instructional media center, and physical facilities and other resources, as they pertain to the whole college of education and as they are adequate for each program within the college. The viewpoint of the standards, therefore, is primarily institutional, and, for the standards' purposes, appropriate. The teacher education models, however, relate resources--both print materials (as might be found in a library) and mediated materials (or technologies, including computer support, as might be found in a media center)--to the requirements of each instructional module (or to the achievement of each instructional objective). Since most modules include alternative methodologies, the materials required are arranged accordingly.

This design poses a dilemma. If the materials are not adequate or appropriate for a student's achievement of the module's goals, then the module will be revised in this respect, based on feedback from its use. Adequacy in these terms means the availability of the resources to provide alternative materials as directed by successful experiences. Since the models have not been operated, it is not yet known what levels of resources and facilities will be necessary to achieve their goals, but all of the ten teacher education models indicate that the creation of new materials will be a major requirement. It would seem from this viewpoint that both the library and the media center will require great flexibility in developing and providing materials to supplement those created especially for the program. Determining the adequacy of these organizations must await the operation of the models; but an emphasis on effective relationships and cooperative interaction appears, from the standpoint of the models, a more useful approach to evaluating facilities and resources than such institutional concerns as size of collections and so forth.

The Fifth Area: Evaluation, Program Review, and Planning The fifth area requires the institution to evaluate its graduates and to use the results as a basis for program development and improvement. Teachers are to be evaluated "at two critical points: when they complete their programs of study, and after they enter the teaching profession." As already discussed, a significant feature of the learning system is that experience with the system forms a basis for modifications. The principle of feedback is operative within the basic design and operation of the system. The teacher education models provide an evaluation of students at both critical points suggested by the standards, but since both points are part of the models' concept of total program planning, a close relation between output and program can be established. An effective program of evaluation requires that information be readily available at appropriate times. The ten models achieve this aim by providing systematic input-process-output analyses of their programs. Usually these processes are computer assisted. Information can be used to adjust a segment of the program or to redesign the total program.

This concern for relating the student as input and the teacher as output to direct improvements in the program suggests a strong interdependence between standards 3.1, 3.2, and 3.3; and standards 5.1 and 5.2. Each model presents a program of evaluation which tends to link these areas within a unified system of planning and control. Identifying one aspect of the system without relating it to the other parts would yield an incomplete analysis of a model's intention. The two forms of management, the student system and the program system, are closely integrated, so that changes in one must have an effect on the other.

Standard 5.3 requires that the institution maintain a mechanism for long-range planning for teacher education as part of a design for total institutional development. The information provided by the operation of an elementary teacher education model should be particularly valuable to the institution for its planning purposes. Indeed, the ten models themselves are designed to facilitate long-range planning. The Northwest Regional Laboratory model posits a set of principles for an organization and development of programs and presents a model for program change based on variations in pupil need and teacher role. And as Vere De Vault, director of the Wisconsin model, states, "It is the intention of this project not to create a perfect model, but to create a process for developing models to meet changing needs." Perhaps this response to the requirements of long-range, integrated planning will mark the most significant contribution of the models.

Some Reflections on the New Standards The new approved standards improve upon a previous draft (December, 1967) by directly relating programs to objectives. These revisions in the standards reinforce the planning purposes assigned to the ten elementary teacher education models and should encourage widespread innovative and creative planning. The most significant change is the addition of standard 1.1, the "Design of Curricula," and the preceding prologue. This statement directs that "teacher education curricula are based on objectives reflecting the institution's conception of the teacher's role." The prologue emphasizes the design of curricula based on "explicitly stated objectives" and omits the earlier requirement that programs be presented according to a group of major components (e.g., general studies, professional studies, etc.). A teacher education program is further defined to include "the curriculum, the teaching, the learning, and the supporting resources for the teaching and learning process." These statements establish a basis for accreditation predicated on the relation of program to goals and justify any part of the system by its contribution to effective (and efficient) program design.

Other changes in the first standards require note. Defining programs in terms of courses or other structural bases has been carefully avoided. Only one vestige of this heritage remains: the planned general studies component requires "that at least one-third of each curriculum for prospective teachers consist of studies in the symbolics of information, natural and behavioral sciences, and humanities." No objection to these subjects is suggested, but without evidence establishing the necessary time for achieving "explicitly stated objectives" in these areas, the temporal requirement is meaningless. On the other hand the professional studies component, which formerly required work in specific subjects ("humanistic studies, e.g., history and philosophy of education, and the behavioral studies, e.g., sociology, political science, anthropology, and psychology of education"), now limits its concern to "instruction in the humanistic and behavioral studies." The individual institution finds increased flexibility for the selection and the organization of a program in this area. Again, standard 1.3.3, "Teaching and Learning Theory with Laboratory and Clinical Experience," replaces two statements in the earlier version which dealt with related aspects of this area. The new statement adds the word systematic so that "the professional studies component of each curriculum includes the systematic study of teaching and learning theory with appropriate laboratory and clinical experience."

These changes in the new standards mark a radical transformation in the evaluation of teacher education programs by enhancing the individual institution's facility for creating and incorporating a new and effective learning-teaching format. The standards, however, tend not to require changes in present program structure if the institution is satisfied that it meets the established goals for teacher education. This avoidance of a prescription for change accompanying an acknowledgment of goal-oriented structure should encourage institutional responsibility rather than emphasize the policing function of the accrediting agency.

The ten elementary teacher education models suggest some speculations on the future direction of accreditation standards. The clear relationship of input-process-output elements maintained in the models reflects a strong trend in this direction. While the standards permit such developments, they are still oriented to a "pre-technological" philosophy of program planning and development. This suggestion is emphasized by the analysis of the statements about faculty and the implied separateness of the college and the school in the process of teacher education. As technological processes increase in significance for education (and one may conjecture that the direction of society portends this direction), teacher education will be irrelevant unless consonant with these trends. While the college of education may continue to exercise primary responsibility for the education of teachers, it will find itself increasingly dependent upon a number of other institutions--federal government, industry, foundations, and independent research groups--which will share the functions of goal-setting and program operation.

Technology implies a new importance for planning adjustments in present programs and developing entirely new programs based on perceived changes in the goals and structure of society. Indeed, it is the nature of technology that emphasis is required on planning rather than on operation, and on the interrelationship rather than the uniqueness of parts within the system. Adequate planning also requires the explication of alternative goal systems and methods for achieving stated objectives. These, in turn, lead to the reorganization of institutions and their interrelationships. It seems desirable--and predictable--that future versions of the standards will reflect these changing emphases.

In Conclusion This informal review of the ten elementary teacher education models has indicated that, in general, the NCATE standards provide a useful mechanism for evaluating the models. Complete information, however, will not be available until feasibility studies and operational experiences can be evaluated. For this reason, the ten models have been considered as a group. There are, however, wide differences among the models and their approaches to various topics dealt with by the standards. These distinctions will become clear through operation. As elementary teacher education moves in the direction of interdependence with other educational subsystems, both within the school of education and outside, the directions indicated by the ten models will become increasingly useful. In this respect, they direct the necessity for continued upgrading and improving of standards for accreditation.

Bibliography of Selected AACTE Publications

Burdin, Joel L., and Lanzillotti, Kaliopee, eds. A Reader's Guide to the Comprehensive Models for Preparing Elementary Teachers. Washington, D.C.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education; American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1969. 342 p. Publisher's Price: $4.

Evaluative Criteria Study Committee, American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. Recommended Standards for Teacher Education. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1969. 22 p. Publisher's Price: $1.

Massanari, Karl, ed. Evaluative Criteria for Accrediting Teacher Education. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1967. 130 p. Publisher's Price: $2.50.

"Teacher Education Standards in Review--the Old and the New." AACTE Bulletin, Special Supplement. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1970. 4 p. Publisher's Price: ten cents.

Minimum billed order is $2, with a ten percent discount on five or more orders of the same title. Postage and handling charges are added to billed orders.